

REMARKS

The Examiner's continued attention to the present application is noted with appreciation.

On page 2 of the Office Action dated May 18, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7-9, 12-15, 19-20, 23, 34-35, 46-52, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,553,037 (to Veazey). That rejection is traversed. It does not appear from the disclosure or claims of Veazey that Veazey describes a platform upon which a renewable energy system is disposed and in which that platform is transportable by being carried/transported on a vehicle. The present invention describes a renewable energy system disposed on a platform, and that platform is distinct from the transporting vehicle. Thus, the renewable energy system and platform make up the assembly that is transportable. Claims 1 and 46 have been amended to clarify that distinction.

Therefore, claims 1 and 46 are believed to be allowable. Claims 2-3, 7-9, 12-15, 19-20, 23, 24, and 34-35 are dependent on claim 1, and claims 47-52 and 55 are dependent on claim 46; therefore, those dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7, 12-15, 19-20, 46-52, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,639,239 (to Benn et al.). That rejection is traversed. For the same reasons given above regarding Veasey, claims 1 and 46 are believed to be allowable. Being dependent on claim 1, claims 2-4, 7, 12-15, and 19-20 are believed to be allowable. Being dependent on claim 46, claims 47-52 and 55 are also believed to be allowable.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-6, 10-11, 16, 21-22, 24, 26, 29, 32-33, 37, 39-41, 43, 46, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veazey. That rejection is traversed. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to make a combination of the different components and specific powers of the renewable energy system. However, the Examiner does not cite to any prior art showing how that combination is rendered obvious. Further the Examiner does not state how a combination of Veazey and a combination of those components would result in the present invention in light of the absence of a separate, transportable platform in Veazey.

Therefore, claims 4-1, 10-11, 16, 21-22, 24, 26, 29, 32-33, 37, 39-41, 43, 46, and 53 are believed to be allowable.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17-18, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36-38,

42, 44, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veazey in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0054329 (by Springett). That rejection is traversed. As noted above, Veazey does not describe all of the limitations in claim 1. Springett also does not describe a separate transportable platform. A combination of Veazey and Springett would not result in the present invention. Therefore claims 17-18, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36-38, 42, 44, and 54 are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been avoided and/or traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested.


If any issues remain, or if the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of the issues, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Authorization is given to charge payment of any additional fees required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct. 13-4213.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 28, 2006

By:



Vidal A. Oaxaca, Reg. No. 44,267
Direct line: (505) 998-1505

PEACOCK MYERS, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
P.O. Box 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927
Telephone: (505) 998-1500
Facsimile: (505) 243-2542

Customer No. 005179

G:\AMDS\Sacred Power\Portable Power System_'671_OA Resp_3-06.doc